

McCarthyism, but suddenly the democratic process, under a most democratic President, seems to have shuddered to a halt.

It would be quite unfair to blame President Johnson. He is intolerant, occasionally angry and demanding of agreement. He has at his disposal the greatest and best prepared forces that any free country has ever produced in time of peace, and now, in Washington, it is perfectly plain that he and he alone will make the decision on how these forces will be used.

Washington, for the only time in its history, has become a one-man city and all the ministers and advisers who surround him are only his servants.

FE *VAD Gruening*
THE NEED OF A NEW U.S. POLICY
IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on June 12, at the Santa Monica Civic Auditorium in Santa Monica, Calif., the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] delivered a brief but important address which he began by stating:

Today, the American people and the world are being told that our foreign policy must be left to the Chief Executive and his small handful of advisers because it is too complicated and too important for the American people to understand.

He goes on to say:

The consensus on Vietnam sought today is not a consensus of our people, nor even of the community of nations; it is a consensus among the State Department, Defense Department, CIA, and White House staff. Once that is achieved, the questions from the Congress and the people are hushed up with rebukes suggesting that to ask where we are going in southeast Asia and how we are going to get there amounts to giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

The Senator from Oregon goes on to point out how many of our leaders who have been guiding policy have been mistaken. He points out, for example, that on July 8, 1954, the chief of the U.S. military aid mission in Vietnam, Gen. John O'Daniel, declared:

The war in Indochina can still be won without bringing in one single American soldier to fight. The Vietnamese have ample manpower and even today outnumber the enemy by 100,000 with superior firepower at least in the ratio of 2 to 1, and probably more. And we are ready to assist them in training an adequate national army for the security of their homeland.

The Senator from Oregon goes on to mention more mistaken prophecies; for example, one by Secretary McNamara when he prophesied that in 1965 our military mission would be ended in South Vietnam and we would be withdrawing our troops.

Senator MORSE concludes by saying:

This is no longer an issue of whether an American protests against the war in Vietnam give aid or encouragement to the Vietcong. It is an issue of whether southeast Asia is going to be saved from war and communism by our present policy, and I say it is not. We are driving Asians by the millions into the arms of communism.

The Senator from Oregon concludes with this statement:

The American people must demand a new policy in Asia, not only one of legality and humanity, but most important, one that will work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, SANTA MONICA CIVIC AUDITORIUM, SANTA MONICA, CALIF., JUNE 12, 1965

Today, the American people and the world are being told that foreign policy must be left to the Chief Executive and his small handful of advisers because it is too complicated and too important for the American people to understand. The consensus on Vietnam sought today is not a consensus of our people, nor even of the community of nations; it is a consensus among the State Department, Defense Department, CIA, and White House staff. Once that is achieved, the questions from the Congress and the people are hushed up with rebukes suggesting that to ask where we are going in southeast Asia and how we are going to get there amount to giving aid and comfort to an enemy.

Fifty-two years ago it was similarly unpatriotic to ask questions of Kaiser Wilhelm and Von Moltke, Poincare and Joffre, Asquith and Lord Grey. To question national aims and the means employed to pursue them has, throughout modern history, been silenced as a service to an enemy, just as though all wisdom lay with those in office and none with those who must always pay for the achievement of national aims.

And what a river of blood those men caused to flow across Europe. We look back on the events of two World Wars and we wonder how the people who suffered such terrible misery could have allowed themselves to be propelled into World War I by leaders who today are remembered for their utter blindness and folly in thinking that any of their national aims could be achieved by resort to war and violence.

Yet the same ominous signs of an imposed and enforced national unity are being seen in America today. One of the popular exhibits flashed about by foreign policy officials of our Government is a collection of news broadcasts and published stories from Hanoi and Peiping which express the belief of the Communists that America is weak and divided on its Asian policy as evidenced by teach-ins, by the votes in Congress against blank-check war, and by student disturbances and rallies. No doubt the reports of this meeting will be made in the Communist countries of Asia and cited as an indication that if the war lasts long enough, Americans, like the French before us, will tire of the struggle and give up. And there will be newspaper stories here that will try to convince the public that only Communists and promoters of Communist causes could do such a thing as to question the soundness of American foreign policy as handed down by the combined wisdom of the Defense Department, the State Department, the CIA, and the White House staff.

But what is the record of these people in southeast Asia? Their record is one of having been wrong not once but consistently over 11 years.

On July 8, 1954, the chief of the U.S. military aid mission in Vietnam, Gen. John O'Daniel, declared, and I quote:

"The war in Indochina can still be won without bring in one single American soldier to fight."

The Vietnamese have ample manpower and even today outnumber the enemy by 100,000 with superior firepower at least in a ratio of 2 to 1, and probably more. And we are ready to assist them in training an

adequate national army for the security of their homeland."

We banked over \$2 billion on President Diem for this purpose. And 8 years later we consented to his assassination as a means of removing him because he was losing more and more of South Vietnam to the Vietcong.

In the last 4 years, the record of administration officials has been even worse. With each mission to South Vietnam, we were told by the Secretary of Defense or of State that one more increment of American funds, or helicopters, or advisers would be the one that would put the war effort over. We even heard the Nation's leading expert on Vietnam, Secretary of Defense McNamara, tell us a little over a year ago that 1965 was the year when the American military could come home from Vietnam. His chief announcements today take the form of revealing new assignments of units to Vietnam, the dispatching of more Navy vessels to Vietnam, and the increase in U.S. air raids in Vietnam.

Yet these are the men to whom Americans are told they must place complete, unquestioning, and uncritical confidence. I say that aside from every other objection to such a resignation from our duties as citizens, these people have been too wrong for too long to justify any confidence at all.

But I predict that they will continue to widen and expand this war unless the American people rise to stop them. The next move is not long off because the impact of the last expansion of the war is wearing off.

We are already being prepared through the press for another escalation. We are already reading that while the air raids on the North gave a great boost to the morale of the South, the "boost" is wearing off, and something more will be needed to bolster Saigon back up again.

In his prize-winning account of our adventure with Ngo Dinh Diem, David Halberstam wrote:

"In the spring and summer of 1962, the arrival of the American helicopters had given the faltering cause in Vietnam a booster shot. It had not altered the nature of the war or the enemy's techniques, but they were caught off guard by the new equipment and the increased firepower of the government troops."

But, he continues:

"A year after the American buildup of weaponry and personnel had reached its peak, it was clear that the government had lost the initiative, that the enemy had benefited more from the weapons than we had, that his capacity had increased more than the Army of South Vietnam in the past year, and that with the failure of the Government civic program the guerrillas' tactical position was also superior."

"The American buildup which had been prompted by a deteriorating situation in late 1961, had lost its edge and momentum; the Communists had learned to react, and thanks to the outposts the enemy had been able to use the Government as a supply store."

The raids on the North by American planes have gone through much the same pattern. Great rejuvenation was reported among the soldiers and politicians of the South. But Sunday (June 6) the New York Times tells us that "in the last 8 days the Vietcong guerrillas have dispelled almost all the optimism that the South Vietnamese Government had been promoting for 3 months. The Communist forces appear to have proved, if there were doubts, that the South Vietnamese Army fared well all spring only by default."

This time the American response has been to move American ground forces in to do the fighting, in addition to the bombing. Sixty thousand troops are now the legacy of General O'Daniel's policy that 600 U.S. military

men could train and equip South Vietnam to defend itself.

These people are wrong about Vietnam, and they have been wrong for 10 years. If we have learned anything at all there, it must be that the United States cannot impose alone its own enforcement of the Geneva agreement upon Vietnam. We are sliding ever closer to the abyss of total war in the attempt.

If there is to be peace in Vietnam, and if there is even to be defeat of the Communists in Vietnam, it will have to come through an international peace force. It is still not too late for the United States to seek such an international peace force either through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization or through the United Nations, or possibly through the Afro-Asian peace force suggested by Indian Prime Minister Shastri. I am not deterred by the objection that China or North Vietnam or the Soviet Union is opposed to an international peace force. They are certainly opposed to our bombing of North Vietnam but we are doing it, so it is not opposition from the Communists that determines whether we will follow a given policy.

The difference is that an international peace-keeping mission has some chance of bringing peace to Vietnam. The United States has not brought peace to Vietnam, and we have not saved it from communism, either. The terror tactics of the Communists in the villages of South Vietnam are matched in full measure by the horror visited upon them by American napalm, strafing, and bombing. We read over the weekend that after American planes had bombed the Vietcong retreating into the hills of central South Vietnam, "One estimate was as high as 500 killed by the strikes. The American contention is that they were Vietcong soldiers. But three out of four patients seeking treatment in a Vietnamese hospital afterward for burns from napalm were village women."

The Communists murder and kidnap and maim the villagers; we burn them with jellied gasoline. That is some record of fighting for freedom. It is interesting that the Pentagon Building puts out careful statistics of the number of South Vietnamese killed each month by Vietcong terrorists, but tells me it has no figures on South Vietnamese killed in the military action of American and South Vietnamese soldiers.

This is no longer an issue of whether American protests against the war in Vietnam give aid or encouragement to the Vietcong. It is an issue of whether southeast Asia is going to be saved from war and communism by our present policy, and I say it is not. We are driving Asians by the millions into the arms of communism.

The American people must demand a new policy in Asia, not only one of legality and humanity, but most important, one that will work.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SCOTT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the June issue of the "Republicans for Progress" singles out the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] for one more indication of his dedicated service to the Republican Party. I ask unanimous consent that this tribute to Senator Scott be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW STAR?

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who has had his share of political honors, both elective by the people and appointive by his party, is donning a new robe. At the recent successful testimonial (ticket-

selling) dinner honoring Senator DIRKSEN at \$600 a ticket, the champion fund-raiser in the Senate, Senator MORTON of Kentucky, did nothing to lose that position of eminence. But Senator SCOTT, the new vice chairman of the Senate Republican campaign committee, which is headed by MORTON, was not far behind in what, for SCOTT, is a relatively new party role.

REMARKS OF SENATOR KUCHEL IN OPPOSITION TO TITLE III (THE RICE PROGRAM) OF SENATE BILL 1702

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my prepared remarks—presented, last week, to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—in opposition to title III, the rice program of Senate bill 1702.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL IN OPPOSITION TO TITLE III (RICE) PROGRAM OF S. 1702 BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, JUNE 25, 1965

Representatives of our rice industry in California have expressed their grave concern as to title III of S. 1702. I completely agree with their position. Such concern is merited.

In the name of economy, it is proposed to reduce by \$50 million agriculture expenditures for foreign aid and rice price support programs. This is to be accomplished by the device of eliminating export subsidies and lowering support for all rice shipped in export to world price levels. With the realization that such prices would be far too low to provide sufficient income for growers, it is then proposed to increase support prices on rice sold in domestic markets, thus compensating growers for the reduced support in export. This expenditure would be financed by a tax on all rice milled for the domestic market. Such a milling tax would be passed on to the consumers directly by millers.

Unfortunately for the consumer, as a result of these proposals, the price of rice would be increased by 5 cents per pound. This amount has been confirmed by officials of the Department of Agriculture. California rice now sells for approximately \$9.50 per hundredweight, f.o.b. mill; thus, the increase would be in excess of 50 percent before the imposition of various trade channel markups prior to reaching the consumer.

The largest users of rice in many areas, however, are those who have the lowest per capita income. Consequently, the inflationary aspects of such an increase in rice prices on a commodity which is the basic food for millions of people stands in sharp conflict with the concept and purposes of the anti-poverty program. For example, in Puerto Rico, which is the single largest market for California rice, it is estimated that the rice program now proposed by the administration would cost consumers there \$15 million annually as compared to an estimated benefit of only \$7 million which they will secure from the anti-poverty program.

While title III of S. 1702 is advocated on the basis of a national average consumption of 7 pounds per capita, Government economists have failed to give proper weight to the established fact that per capita consumption is in excess of 100 pounds in areas as Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and parts of California and New York. They have also failed to give weight to the loss of essential business with food processors who would find it extremely difficult to pass this increase in

cost along to consumers in competition with other cereals using other commodities lower in price than rice. The result surely would be a drastic decline in the consumption of rice and a worsening of the market. I also have grave doubts as to whether programs authorized by Congress on the judgment that they are for the general welfare such as foreign aid programs using rice should be financed by milling taxes levied on those whose historical dietary habits result in a consumption rate of rice 20 times the national average.

I repeat: Approval of this legislation will surely result in a drastic reduction in domestic consumption with the result that even more Government funds will be required to handle surpluses, which will accumulate in the long run, thus nullifying whatever short run Government economies might be temporarily accomplished.

California, in addition to being a leading rice-producing State, is also a leading State in consumption. My State contains in excess of 2 million citizens of Latin American and oriental extraction to whom rice is still a basic food. This proposed program would thus work great hardship on many of our fellow Americans.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate Committee on Agriculture will give thoughtful consideration to the testimony of the rice growing and milling industry which will be presented in opposition to title III. The industry has assured the Secretary of Agriculture of their desire to sit down with him and work out a realistic program which would result in economies under the existing law. I deeply hope that this will be done with the consequent advantage for the taxpayers and consumers of our country.

TRADE UNION SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICY IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, while there has been confusion in certain sectors of the American press and of the American public on the question of the Dominican Republic, I think it important to point out that there was no such confusion in the ranks of the American trade union movement.

The AFL-CIO realized, on the basis of their own information, that the Communists were on the verge of taking over the Dominican Republic, and that they were frustrated only by American intervention.

The AFL-CIO executive council, in its meeting last month, welcomed "the prompt and energetic measures taken by the President to prevent the Communist attempt to seize control of the Dominican democratic revolutionary movement and to foist a Castro-type dictatorship on Santo Domingo."

The statement went on to say that—"Had our Government shown such prompt initiative in 1959, Cuba would today be a free country, and not a Communist slave state."

The Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers—ORIT—an organization which embraces most of the important labor unions in the hemisphere, adopted a resolution, couched in similar terms, supporting American intervention:

We must point out that the unilateral action of the U.S. Armed Forces in this grave Dominican conflict has, on the one hand, served to save thousands of lives and, at

Appendix

Focus on Project HOPE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe two stories under the joint title, "Focus on Project HOPE," which appeared in a recent issue of the Rockford, Ill., Register-Republic, provide some of the best insight in print to date on this humanitarian program.

In one story the dramatic history of Project HOPE—from its early days when it struggled under the guidance of HOPE President Dr. William B. Walsh to its present, worldwide activities, is well summarized.

In the other account, the observations of a dedicated ophthalmologist, Dr. Vernon C. Voltz, are recorded. I believe his comments on HOPE's work in the new Republic of Guinea illuminate the health problems of emerging nations in West Africa, and the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Register-Republic article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOCUS ON PROJECT HOPE—ROCKFORD EYE DOCTOR HEALED AFRICAN NATIVES

Among the more than 700 American physicians, dentists, nurses, and auxiliary personnel who have served aboard the hospital ship, SS *Hope*, is Dr. Vermon C. Voltz, Rockford ophthalmologist.

Dr. Voltz was one of three eye doctors to serve with Project HOPE during its first tour at Conakry, Guinea, in west Africa during October 1964.

The system used in Africa differed somewhat from that of previous missions.

Each doctor, nurse, and technician from America had an African counterpart with whom he or she worked closely, teaching skills and the effective teamwork necessary to modern medicine.

The intensive training was done through on-the-job treating of thousands of sick and afflicted.

Necessary diagnosis and training were done mostly in the clinic; some was done in the classrooms, but at all times the emphasis was on teaching.

STAFF HOSPITALS

Dr. Voltz said most of the staff worked at the 2 hospitals in Conakry in the morning, attending about 25 patients per day. In the afternoon, the staff worked on the ship helping as many as 40 patients per day.

All the time, the counterparts were there learning and doing.

In the eye department of the hospital, where Dr. Voltz spent most of his time, there was one doctor in charge of teaching four assistants.

The assistants actually did much of the work, including eye surgery, normally done only by a qualified doctor of medicine, even though they had had no formal training.

Dr. Voltz classified them as amateurs doing ocular surgery, but he said they were eager to learn.

They knew how to straighten eyes, and they worked daily in their local clinics and on the ship.

The goal was to turn over to them various duties after these duties had been demonstrated to them. The goal has not been reached yet, Dr. Voltz said, but there is hope for success, and progress is being made. Their big need is to improve technique, he said.

Dr. Voltz left New York October 13, 1964, with the other doctors for the trip to Dakar, Africa. From there, the group went to Conakry, a city of 80,000 on the west coast of Africa.

GETS TO WORK

The new *Hope* staff was given 1 day to adjust to its new environment, and then went into its medical program.

Hope personnel were confined to the coastal area away from the Congo or other threatened areas.

Dr. Voltz described the people of Conakry as timid but friendly, and they liked to have their pictures taken, except for certain adults who had some sort of superstition about cameras.

The city itself has many modern buildings and facilities, but much of it is Russian.

This is evidenced by a modern hotel, a modern school, an athletic field and many Soviet freighters tied up at the wharf.

But the Soviet influence is waning. The modern Russian facilities are unused because there are no Russians to use them or Guineans who are able to use them.

The city's presidential palace is considered beautiful by Dr. Voltz, and the architecture of the hospital in which he worked is modern by any standard even though it looks like a slum because of poor maintenance.

The water holes in Conakry are slushy and are used for taking baths as well as for washing dishes and for drinking.

SQUALOR ABOUNDS

There is squalor and poverty. The place is very primitive; just as in the storybooks, Dr. Voltz said.

He described health conditions in Conakry as poor and unsanitary.

Postoperative conditions were horrible and showed a great lack of administration. Dressings would be rotten and saturated with discharge. And a patient would pile his dirty clothes in the anteroom to the operating room before surgery, and then put on the same dirty garments when leaving.

There would be more than one patient in a single bed; a mother would be in bed with her inflicted children; meningitis was deplorable; childbirth complications lasted as long as 4 or 5 years; and malnutrition was a major problem, even in some of the eye cases.

Dr. Voltz said Guinea has only 80 M.D.'s to serve its 3 million people.

He said language was no real problem. Translators from many sources were used much of the time. They usually came as Peace Corps volunteers, aid program workers, and families of Embassy personnel. French and English were used most of the time.

There wasn't much professional contact with fields other than ophthalmology except in a consulting capacity, Dr. Voltz said.

But, he said he did get involved with a full

range of ophthalmologic diseases. Problems were similar to those at home except they usually were more advanced.

He said the most impressive part of his tour was the reaction he got from his first cataract patient.

The man was so elated at being able to see again that after he found he could see again, he grasped the doctor's hand and shook it vigorously, stood back and threw him a salute, and then grabbed his hand and kissed it.

But more descriptive of an acute case cured by *Hope* physicians was the large face tumor of a native man. His face was swollen to twice its normal size with one eye pushed near the other. He had gone this way for some time, but only 2 weeks after surgeons had removed the tumor, the man's face was back to normal and he hardly could tell he had been inflicted.

Dr. Voltz said he also was very impressed just with having had the opportunity to be associated with such a remarkably professional group. They were alert, cooperative, congenial, friendly, and professionally dedicated.

"They were a fine group; a close group, I would very much like to return," he said.

But like any trip, he said he was glad to be home.

OLD SHIP BRINGS "HOPE" TO NEEDY

A dream became a reality in 1958 when a U.S. Navy ship was taken from the mothball fleet and rechristened the SS *Hope*.

Project HOPE—Health Opportunity for People Everywhere—is the principal activity of the People-to-People Health Foundation.

This independent, nonprofit corporation formed by the American people bring the skills and techniques developed by the American medical, dental, and paramedical professions to needy people in newly developing areas of the world.

HOPE began in 1958 when President Eisenhower asked Dr. William B. Walsh, a prominent Washington heart specialist, to initiate a project aimed at international good will and understanding through person-to-person contact.

The plan Dr. Walsh submitted was for the world's first peacetime hospital ship, a reconverted, 15,000-ton veteran of World War II and the Korean war.

The SS *Hope* first sailed from San Francisco in September 1960, with a crack medical staff chosen from thousands of applicants.

Its destination—Indonesia.

Its mission—to spread good will to the people of this nation and to show them the skills of American medicine.

Its methods—to cure some of the acute cases, to instruct indigenous medical personnel in modern medical methods, and to show all the people of this country the general good will of the American people.

FIGURES SHOW

Figures alone could show the success of the SS *Hope* in Indonesia—200 doctors and 300 nurses trained, 1,000 lectures and seminars held, 18,000 patients treated, 700 operations performed, and thousands examined or X-rayed.

But the real story is revealed by the mayor of the Indonesian island of Sumbawa in remarks made to Dr. Walsh as the ship departed:

A3352

"This is the first time foreigners came to Sumbawa who did not come to steal our rice. I do not know where the United States is nor had I seen the flag of your country until this great white ship came to us, though I am an old man. But hear me: We will never forget what you have done."

The next port was Saigon, South Vietnam, in June 1961.

Even in the midst of increasing Communist guerrilla attacks, Project HOPE was able to teach native doctors new ways of administering medical treatment, to treat 10,000 patients, to perform 500 major operations, and to conduct oral surgery—to say nothing of creating goodwill.

After 4 months in Vietnam, the great white ship left for San Francisco.

It was no longer an experiment without precedent. It was now tried and proven under the most difficult of circumstances.

In the spring of 1962, the SS *Hope* sailed for Trujillo and Salaverry, Peru, in South America where in 10 months its services reached 80,000 persons directly and several hundred thousand indirectly.

TEAM FORMED

The new 210-bed Trujillo Hospital now has a team of "Hopers" assisting the native staff and a team of 25 nurses, technicians, and physicians is at the University of Trujillo School of Medicine.

Another ship and shore-based medical teaching services were in Ecuador where the medical and nursing professions of Ecuador and the faculty of the University of Guayaquil worked with Project HOPE staff members to learn new and better methods of caring for the sick.

Also, outpatient clinics were established at Quito, Cuenca, and Duran.

These two areas in South America have been hotbeds of anti-Americanism and fertile ground for Communist propaganda, but the people soon were affected by the compassion and friendship that emanated from the great white ship.

Slum clinics were set up to treat many and to screen those for admission to the ship. The *Hope* operating rooms were connected to classrooms by closed circuit TV, and averaged 12 operations per day.

Immunization programs for children were established and public health measure initiated by HOPE teams.

Everywhere the ship goes the emphasis is on teaching and training conducted through actual hospital procedure, classroom lectures and discussions, motion pictures, and film strips, and special Saturday night medical symposiums aboard ship.

Teaching is stressed because it enables Project HOPE to have a more enduring effect on local health conditions than would result by merely giving widespread treatment to the inflicted.

This plan enables HOPE to upgrade the local capabilities to diagnose and treat sickness. Local people, in turn, become able, to teach others, and thus the impact of HOPE grows and spreads.

HOPE hopes to raise the standards of these new medics to at least the equivalent of a trained military medical corpsman.

ALL HELP

Helping to make this program work are physicians, dentists, nurses, anesthetists, paramedical, and technical personnel including physical therapists, dieticians, dental hygienists, medical technicians, X-ray technicians, medical secretaries, records librarian, pharmacists, and ancillary personnel.

SS *Hope* is a complete and very modern hospital with all the latest equipment available.

The Need for Victory in the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators two outstanding editorials on the subject of the need for victory in the war in Vietnam. One was published on June 19 in the News & Courier, of Charleston, S.C., and is entitled "Needed: A Victory Goal." The other editorial was published on June 24 in the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., and is entitled "Air Power for Victory: Red Showdown in Asia, a War We Must Win." The editorial in the Nashville Banner refers to, and quotes from, some very pertinent comments recently made by Gen. Mark Clark, an outstanding and distinguished South Carolinian, who has achieved much fame as an educator, a diplomat, and a military commander and strategist.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, June 19, 1965]

NEEDED: A VICTORY GOAL

Use of B-52 intercontinental bombers against Vietcong targets in South Vietnam introduces a new element in the Far East conflict. But we doubt that it will determine the outcome of the war. Moreover, the U.S. military goal is still unclear.

Bombing with conventional weapons has yet to win a war. Neither the Luftwaffe attack on Britain or the U.S. fire raids against Japan were decisive. Only the use of an atomic bomb brought an end to World War II.

A strong case can be made that strategic bombing with iron bombs is not effective. What the soldiers need is close aerial support a hundred yards ahead of them during an attack. Bombs dropped 500 miles away from the front have only long-range economic importance. A war has to be won on the front where men are fighting, not in the rear areas.

President Johnson is to be commended for not agreeing to the left-wing demand that he practice appeasement of the Communists. But Mr. Johnson apparently is without a well-defined military objective in southeast Asia. Sending in large numbers of U.S. troops is no substitute for a clear-cut goal.

The way to halt an aggressor is to destroy his military power. This truth is as old as warfare. When armies are used merely in an effort to frighten a foe, then armed power is misused in a dangerous way. Energy is frittered away, and the enemy is left free to gain strength. This was Germany's mistake on the Russian front. The German armies were used simply to cover territory and convince the world that they were victorious. But they failed to move in de-

cisive fashion to destroy the Soviet forces in the field and to seize the most strategic bits of territory. The United States may be making the same mistake in southeast Asia.

For a number of months, the United States has used its forces in less than efficient fashion. Marines have been deployed as airbase guards. Land and sea-based fighters have been ordered by Washington to attack targets far from the battle front. It would be tragic if American lives were wasted away in a piecemeal, fragmentary effort in South Vietnam. If American forces are to be used in southeast Asia in large numbers, they should only be used in a campaign that has a major military goal that will advance the security of the United States.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, June 24, 1965]

AIRPOWER FOR VICTORY: RED SHOWDOWN IN ASIA, A WAR WE MUST WIN

It still is true, as when the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur stated it in April 1951, that, once war is joined, "there is no substitute for victory." Events have underscored it, notably in Asia—where the war occasioning that warning was not won. The substitute contrived in the retreat from realities there was the futile sacrifice of thousands of American lives, and an uneasy truce which directly paved the way for future Communist aggression as in South Vietnam.

The truism applies today. It is significantly related to what another American commanding officer in that war of the 1950's, Gen. Mark Clark, said Wednesday concerning the necessary steps for victory in Vietnam. Point 1 of that is to hit the enemy with the full weight of our Air Force and naval aviation powers.

It would be preposterous, and militarily suicidal, to propose a manpower swapout in fighting on the ground. As General Clark warns, the United States must continue to bomb North Vietnam or face "another Korea." And emphasis belongs on the collateral point as well: that in this strategic course we would be employing forces of unquestioned superiority, hitting the enemy where he is weakest, and depriving him of the advantage of choosing weapons and battlefield.

America's military authorities know the necessity for that. There must be no hesitancy in the policymaking circles about acting in the light of that knowledge; for the chips, discernibly, are down. The enemy sneers at proposals for negotiation. Confident of security in a privileged sanctuary, both Hanoi and Peiping rattle the sword, and launch new forays from bases they deem (by precedent) immune to attack.

The knockout blows to win this war must come from the air—and they must not be delayed indefinitely if the free world is not to suffer a humiliating and avertable setback there, where scores of thousands of American fighting men already have been committed.

Yes, Red China could be directly in the line of fire—by her own choice, as the instigator and participant criminis of Communist conspiracy reaching for all Asia. Military authorities need no reminder, surely, nor realists in the policymaking circles, that a major opportunity was overlooked to demolish the Peiping threat when squeamish timidity made its decision just under 15 years ago to back down in the face of it.

Red China has manpower in the millions it regards as expendable. But it also has extreme vulnerability to American strength in the air. Those shuddering at that tactic on the ground of possibility that it would

bring Soviet Russia into the conflict are resting timidity's case on the same hypothesis that crowned the Korean affair with defeat and disaster. The Banner is among those doubting that the Soviet would join its needling partner in a gamble of that magnitude; or risk a world war to rescue it from a folly of its own making.

One thing is sure—a showdown with communism must come sometime if it is not, by piecemeal aggression, to gobble up the earth.

It must be defeated somewhere—and defeat is not achieved by tactics of defeat and policies of surrender.

It takes a will to win, backed by the strength that is there, ready and waiting. And that is the opposite of the purblind no-win policy mysteriously contrived and too long countenanced.

President Johnson knows those realities, as preliminary steps have indicated. He deserves the backing of the Nation, in a showdown that can determine—with full courageous followthrough—what sort of world we are to live in. America itself deserves that, whose sons are fighting and dying where they were sent. The Chief Executive, with the awesome burdens of responsibility, certainly deserves better than the sniping of policy critics, and professorial "teach-iners," propagandizing a theme of ideological blind man's buff, and shouting "negotiate" as the *ipse dixit* of peace with freedom's enemies.

Douglas MacArthur was right. There is no substitute for victory.

Gen. Mark Clark is right. As did MacArthur, he hates war. He has seen it off and on, through most of a lifetime in his country's uniform. He knows that when one comes it must be won.

It is time the American people understood this, which is the only course for Lyndon Johnson.

Medical Libraries and Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY OF RHODE ISLAND IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at the John Shaw Billings Centennial, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md., on June 17, 1965:

MEDICAL LIBRARIES AND MEDICAL RESEARCH
(By the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S.
Representative from Rhode Island)

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to honor an individual whose great life and work helped materially in diverse ways to organize and advance the cause of medicine. The debt to Dr. John Shaw Billings is not a debt only of physicians and others in the health sciences. It is a debt of the entire Nation. Dr. Billings' achievements in helping to consolidate and focus the progress of medicine through its literature have benefited the lives of all of us, even today, 100 years later.

It is most proper for us to recognize also that it was Dr. Billings, who, through the National Board of Health, actually made the first Federal grants for medical research. In the 1880 Annual Report¹ of the Board, Dr.

Billings, in his capacity as vice president, writes to the Honorable John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury, to which the Board was answerable. Dr. Billings' letter speaks to the importance of medical research and cites the commendable work of the British Government in supporting such research. His report points out that the costs of research exceed the funds available to private investigators and emphasizes that the assistance of the Federal Government is therefore necessary. Sounds like 1965.

His report then lists out the types of projects the National Board of Health was supporting. These include:

Studies of the air, a forerunner to our present air pollution research; studies of the adulterations of food and drugs, matters about which we are still concerned; sanitation; yellow fever; disinfectants; diphtheria; and still other fields.

I have been extremely pleased to learn that my own State of Rhode Island was included in the research work financed by the old National Board of Health under Dr. Billings' direction. The annual report of the Board of 1882-83 years ago—contains a report of inspections of health resorts and under that a "Report on Sanitary Conditions in Newport, R.I." It is a very fascinating document including many maps, drawings, and illustrations including these three [unfolds three large illustrations]. One of these is a map of the city of Newport and the other two are graphs showing occupation figures and nationality figures in ward 3 of the city.

Beyond the question of sanitation the report is concerned with the city's water supply; and I believe the remarkable farsightedness of Dr. Billings is illustrated by the fact that the report contains extensive information on different types of analyses carried out on the water.

I am happy to say that the report about Newport was a very good one and I will illustrate this if I may by reading the first sentence of the report: "Newport has always been considered, and unquestionably is, naturally, an exceptionally healthy place."² Naturally I believe it still is.

From this particular locale here today it is easy to see and feel the importance of Dr. Billings' work—in the dignity, power, and significance we in America have given to medicine, and which in turn is serving to give us healthier, longer, more productive and happier lives. We stand on the steps of the world's greatest medical library. Next door to our north is the world's finest medical research organization. Across the street is the great National Naval Medical Center, and only a short distance from here is the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.

If there were a pinnacle of the world of medicine at which we could stand, this would be it.

It is a world as yet unfinished, however. We have not defeated disease, disability, birth defects, and premature death. These problems continue to challenge us to the limit of our abilities. At the same time, we seem to have achieved, at long last, the opportunity at least for almost total victory. It would seem to be within our grasp to attain an entirely new level of mental and physical health for mankind and perhaps witness the eradication of disease entirely.

We are living in the midst of dramatic and far-reaching changes in the concepts of biomedical research, with the employment of new knowledge, new techniques, new ideas, new instrumentation, and, indeed, new types of personnel, such as mathematicians and physicists. The influence and effects of the biomedical research effort are becoming wider

and its character is changing. There is ample evidence that the biomedical achievements of the near future may be dramatically more significant than any in the past. I have in mind particularly a new spectrum of work in human reproduction and human development; molecular biology and genetics, and the new light they promise to throw on work in many other biomedical disciplines; and the extensive work in viruses, in relation to cancer and other diseases. In recent testimony before Congress, Dr. James A. Shannon, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, pointed to new progress in understanding the relationship between psychology and physiology. He said: "The line between the medical sciences and the behavioral sciences is disappearing." This is as it should be.

In this place, on this day, at this particular point in history, it is difficult to avoid a sense of happy anticipation about the new hope being offered us by the health sciences; and it is proper that we again recognize Dr. Billings' work in having begun this great Institution, this library where this new knowledge resides for man's present and future use.

However, let me read something to you: "Unless major attention is directed to the improvement of our national medical library base, the continued and accelerated generation of scientific knowledge will become increasingly an exercise in futility."³

The statement is from a section headed Communications for Research, from volume I of the report by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

Let us consider carefully what this statement means. It is saying that the great potential benefits of medical research which I have just been talking about may not be improving the health of our Nation as they might. It indicates that the financial, human, and institutional investments we are pouring into research, to bring about better health for the American people, may be wasted or lost for the want of better facilities and methods to house, manage, and disseminate the medical literature.

This is indeed a curious commentary on the Nation which leads the world in its concern for health and medicine; and it could be a tragic commentary if the vast sums the Federal Government spends for medical research, education, and practice, were being rendered less effective because we are not willing to spend a few more dollars, relatively, for the medical libraries which serve as the communication centers for health science information.

Just how much money are we talking about?

If we talk only of research, the Federal Government is spending well over \$1 billion, and private sources are spending another \$600 or \$700 million. Last year, out of the \$1 billion provided in Federal funds, less than \$1 million, under present legislative authorities, could accrue to the benefit of the nongovernment medical libraries. That's about one-tenth of 1 percent. If we try to make a comparison to the total budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of \$5½ billion, the comparison becomes even more ridiculous. The Federal Government is simply not paying its share of the Nation's costs for medical communications, even though it has helped to intensify the problem by its emphasis on, and support of, medical research.

We must remember that the medical libraries, as the prime storehouses and distributors of health science information, are feeling the pressures of all of our national

¹ House of Representatives, 46th Cong., 3d sess. Ex. Doc. No. 8. Annual Report of the National Board of Health, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1880.

² Bowditch, E. W., report of an inspection of certain health resorts. In: U.S. National Board of Health. Annual Report of 1882. Washington, 1883. App. C, p. 153.

³ U.S. President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. Report to the President; a national program to conquer heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Washington, 1964, vol. I.

A3354

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 28, 1965

activities in relation to health and medicine, both private and public. All of the tremendous increases in health and medical activities have an impact on the medical libraries. All research papers, journals, pamphlets, reports, conference proceedings, handbooks—nearly every printed document, in fact, which grows out of our concern for man's health, becomes something the medical libraries must acquire, store, and disseminate to those who need the information. Then these massive health activities generate greater demands on the medical libraries for services.

As a measure of these demands, let us take due notice of the fact that all public and private health and medical expenditures in the Nation today total more than \$35 billion.

If this is a measure of our health concerns, we have failed very seriously—I hope not irreparably—to recognize and tend to the fundamental requirements for medical information and particularly medical libraries.

My special concern here today is for the medical libraries in relation to the promise held for us in medical research. Medical research is impossible without an adequate information base, without the resources and services of medical libraries. It has been said—and I believe this must be true—that all medical research begins and ends with the medical literature. If this is so true, then why are we jeopardizing our own purpose by scrimping when it comes to giving the medical scientist the library tools he needs?

Sir William Osler, who was a close friend of Dr. Billings, once said: "To study the phenomena of disease without books is to sail an uncharted sea, while to study books without patients is not to go to sea at all." My friends in medicine tell me that this applies today as it did at the turn of the century.

The literature constitutes an integral part of the process of studying human biology and human diseases. To limit its usefulness is to limit the scientist and to limit man's chance for the new level of health I talked about earlier.

Today it clearly is not enough to say that medical scientists need information. The real question, instead, is just how do we meet their information requirements? We long ago recognized—or we should have recognized—that the production of books and journals was not enough, and that putting these books and journals in libraries was not enough. Dr. Billings saw this 86 years ago. He instituted control and access to the literature by producing the first comprehensive index to medical articles in 1879. This has been acknowledged by many to be America's greatest contribution to medicine in the 19th century.

But the quantity of the literature for some years has so overwhelmed all of our information-handling concepts as to render them obsolete. The worldwide production of biomedical literature is now estimated at more than 250,000 articles or 5 million pages per year. That many pages would constitute a stack higher than the Empire State Building. It obviously is of no help to the medical scientist to expose him to 5 million pages of literature in a year's time or a half-million pages or even 100,000 pages, unless you want him to do nothing but read the literature; and that is not what we want him to do. In fact, it would be impossible for him to read it in the time available. We want him to fulfill, to the most effective level possible, his capacities and opportunities for research, and if he is to do this his own effort to acquire information must be among the less time consuming of his concerns. He

must have ready access to those parts of the literature relevant and pertinent to his scientific pursuits.

It is interesting to note that the problem is not new. Dr. Vannevar Bush in 1944 said: "The summation of human experience is being expanded at a prodigious rate, but the means we use for threading through the consequent maze to the momentarily important item is the same as was used in the days of square-rigged ships—the modern great library is not generally consulted; it is just nibbled at by a few." Libraries must be made more attractive and more functional so that bigger bites of information are taken by those who need it.

The quantity of the literature, however, is not the only problem. Our achievements have been such that the whole character of biomedical research has changed and out of this change has come a transformation in the structure of the health sciences. The particular classification of the sciences—necessary for their organization in teaching and research—has been outmoded. The divisions between disciplines have faded and new disciplines have been formed. Some, as we have noted earlier, have been found to have significance in nearly all other biomedical disciplines.

In 1962, Dr. Robert R. Wagner had this to say: "In the future, organization of basic science departments as separate disciplines will lose all validity. This eventuality is a natural concomitant of the centralization of biological thought. Even today, a visitor to a medical school can distinguish one department from another only by the lettering on the office doors of the department chairmen."

So the problem of the scientist is not only one of tremendous magnitude in the literature but one also in which the disciplinary guidelines have ceased to have their former meaning. The complex interrelationships of the vast amount of data with which he is confronted may be such as to keep him from knowing just where to look; and certainly these two situations of quantity and complexity conspire not only to consume the time which he should be spending at his bench, but possibly also to bring confusion and frustration into his efforts. Physicians and scientists need information specialists to help them in the same way they need and use laboratory assistants and coworkers. We must begin to train these new types of librarians in abundance, and as soon as possible.

Also we need research in the field of information science. In 1960, Dr. Don R. Swanson said, "The sheer abundance of recorded knowledge and the growth rate thereof seems to foreshadow a crisis in inundation. The implied dearth of scientific information might be forestalled by engineering breakthroughs, but such breakthroughs may depend on first acquiring a deeper understanding of the conceptual nature of the problem itself."

Before we can develop the systems and mechanisms to provide information to the scientists—even before we can conduct truly effective research in this area—we must know what information the scientist must have.

And he very well may not know what it is he wants. Since 70 percent of the medical literature is published in foreign languages, he may not be aware of what is going on elsewhere.

He is not expected to be an information

expert; and as a man whose life is devoted to uncovering new knowledge, he cannot be expected to anticipate fully and accurately, if at all, what information he is going to need to relate to his work on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis. However, he should have quick access to all information when he is able to identify his needs.

During World War II there used to be jokes about high-ranking military officers in the Pentagon pounding their desks and saying, and I quote: "I don't know what it is I want, but I know I am not getting it." The biomedical scientists of the Nation today strike me as individuals who can honestly and justifiably cry out in this manner.

NLM has begun to meet this urgent need through the use of computers. Medlars (medical literature analysis and retrieval system) provides a fast method of recovering bibliographic citations in any medical discipline or any combination of disciplines. However, Medlars' tremendous searching power has not yet been decentralized across the Nation as it must be soon. It is the only system of its type in the world and its establishment in a research library is a spectacular achievement.

Still we must learn more about the scientist's habits of using information and his requirements for urgency, variety, and volume. We must know his needs for secondary publication forms, such as indexes, abstracts, data compendia, critical reviews. There are library functions and they need to be supported considerably beyond the current level.

These studies necessarily must be related to concurrent studies in medical terminology and classification, machine indexing and new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing health science information.

In addition, the whole scheme of biomedical librarianship as it is now practiced must be studied and reevaluated—the object being to meet fully the users' needs.

We must immediately begin to develop medical libraries with a new concept of service responsibilities to the medical scientist. These libraries must have the flexibility and versatility to be active—not passive—partners in the research process. They must be staffed with people of imagination, advanced training and special skills necessary to assist the research scientist in every possible way. Certainly these libraries must have the resources in books, journals, equipment, and people necessary for them to fulfill their missions.

Just 2 months ago volume II of the report by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke was released. It contains a section entitled "A Program for Developing Medical Libraries." It was prepared by the Subcommittee on Facilities of the Commission, and it tells a truly alarming story of the state of disrepair of the Nation's medical libraries. I think I should state frankly that we, the American people, have permitted this unfortunate condition to develop.

Let me read from one part of the report:

"The cutting edge of the country's medical research program may be blunted by the growing inability of scientists to gain quick and easy access to biomedical data they need. Teachers and students are hampered in their educational pursuits. Of direct and immediate importance to the health of the Nation are urgent needs of medical practitioners of all types for more ready access to the growing body of new medical information. Inefficiency in the medical library network creates an insidious ignorance which neither science nor the practice of medicine can condone. It results in the unplanned and unnecessary duplication of research efforts. It postpones the application of new knowledge

* Osler, Sir William: Sir William Osler aphorisms from his bedside teachings and writings. Collected by R. B. Bean; ed. by W. E. Bean. New York, Henry Schuman, 1950. 159 p.

^a Wagner, R. R.: The basic medical sciences, the revolution in biology and the future of medical education. *Yale J. Biol. Med.* 35: 1-1, 1962.

^b Swanson, D. R.: Searching natural language text by computer. *Science* 132: 1099-1104, 1960.

Brawley was Executive Director of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee staff from 1949 until 1961, when he became Deputy Postmaster General. He had many political contacts in Washington, and was regarded as one of the best informed on post office and civil service matters.

While Day's request to J. Edgar Hoover for an FBI investigation primarily was aimed at the question of whether Brawley retained his stock while a Post Office official, Day also questioned the propriety of Brawley's acquisition of stock in any mail-order house that had such a great stake in legislation dealing with parcel post and other mail rates.

COMMON PRACTICE

On the question of the propriety of buying the Spiegel stock while on the Senate committee staff, Brawley stated "It has been common practice at the Capitol for employees to make such investments and "there is no law to prohibit it."

"There are always a lot of tips floating around the Capitol," Brawley said. He estimated that "there must be 50 Senators" who are constantly investing in tips that are available. He added that in his opinion the problem of a possible conflict is much more acute for Senators than for staff members who do not vote.

Brawley said he obtained his stock tip from some of the Spiegel officials and that he borrowed two-thirds of the \$10,000 purchase price from a South Carolina bank in which one of his relatives is an officer.

A Spiegel official had told him the firm was installing electronic computers and other laborsaving devices and was due for a move forward, Brawley said. He said the stock was priced at only about \$10 a share but was paying \$1 a share in dividends.

"The increase was sensational," Brawley said. "I hoped it would go up, but I had no idea it would pay like it did."

Brawley contends that much of his trouble came from a "former friend," Cyril T. Anderson, whom he introduced to Spiegel officials and recommended for a job as lobbyist for Spiegel.

Anderson said he was not sure that it was Brawley who introduced him to Spiegel officials, and did not know if Brawley had recommended him as a Spiegel lobbyist.

Anderson said he had some differences of viewpoint on legislation with Brawley in 1961 and 1962, but that he considered this "normal" since he represented a firm that opposed the Kennedy administration's large mail rate increase.

Day told the Register that he "heard of some disturbing reports concerning Brawley."

"I passed the information on to the proper law enforcement authorities for investigation," Day said.

ONE OF THE REPORTS

Brawley said the reports had included a story that he had received a \$10,000 political contribution and had split it with two members of the White House staff.

Brawley said he made a telephone call to a Washington representative of a business publications organization and arranged for the \$10,000 contribution.

He said that he was able to demonstrate that the money was delivered in cash to Matthew McCloskey, then the treasurer of the National Democratic Party, for a box seat at the 1961 gala to pay off the 1960 campaign debt.

Brawley said McCloskey had written a note for the file which showed that he had received the money for the box seat. Brawley said the man who delivered the cash to McCloskey had a witness with him. Brawley said he had no contact with this money.

Since leaving the Post Office Department, Brawley said he has invested in the stock of the National Bank of Commerce of Fairfax County, Va.

Brawley said he is a director of the recently organized bank that received its charter from Comptroller of the Currency James Saxon on August 13, 1963. He said it is his only present investment.

The records of the Comptroller of the Currency Office also list Brawley as the senior vice president of the National Bank of Commerce.

Support for the United Nations

SPEECH

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1965, the United Nations celebrated the 20th anniversary of the signing of its charter in San Francisco. Our President was present for that occasion and delivered an eloquent and timely restatement of this country's faith in the United Nations. The action of Congress in passing Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 was important in adding to the support given by our Nation to the N.U. Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER's leadership in the House of Representatives in this important area was extremely important.

All of us know the tribulations under which the United Nations has operated in this past year. We have seen first withdrawal by a country of its membership in the political aspects of the United Nations. Many have wondered if this was a repeat performance of problems of the League of Nations and pondered as to whether or not this would signal a breakup of the still quite young United Nations.

It was important for the President to express the support and faith we Americans have in the United Nations at this crucial time. We are fully aware that without this common ground for discussion and action many world crises would not have been eased or averted. The possibility of an all-out nuclear war would be multiplied a hundredfold.

All of us are concerned about a peaceful world. We see the United Nations as an alternative to the power struggle between nations and a resulting nuclear war. But we should not expect more than is reasonable from this young organization. The United Nations is still in its formative years and has much growing to do before it has reached full maturity and strength. We need to give it our full support so that we do not drag it to the ground and ourselves with it.

As the United Nations grows in responsibility and strength, we hope to see it equipped with the tools to enable it to avoid the conflicts and pitfalls of the Congo, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic. More than that, it may show us through cooperation the way to eradicate hunger, disease, and ignorance. Let us join those who call for a strengthened United Nations through vigorous U.S. support.

To Get the Best Takes Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very timely and thoughtful commentary on a major domestic problem was written by Mr. A. T. Burch in the June 18 edition of the Chicago Daily News. Since Mr. Burch is a respected journalist whose objectivity is above question, I feel his words deserve careful consideration:

To GET THE BEST TAKES MUCH MONEY
(By A. T. Burch)

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court decided that legally enforced segregation of public schools violates the equal protection provisions of the U.S. Constitution.

It struck down the Court's previous approval of "separate but equal" provisions for Negro education. It asserted that separate school systems are inherently unequal.

On several occasions, the Reverend Martin Luther King has asserted that the Court had declared de facto segregation, arising from neighborhood residential patterns, to be unconstitutional. This might seem to be implied in the proposition that separate education cannot be equal. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court has not actually said that de facto segregation in the schools is illegal.

In at least three instances, it has refused to reverse decisions by U.S. Courts of Appeals which had held that the neighborhood school system, which often results in some actual segregation, is not unconstitutional in itself. These courts approved the neighborhood system provided it arises naturally from the facts of population distribution, and is not the result of a prior purpose to create segregation.

The Supreme Court has not made any extended declaration of its own on this subject. It merely refused to review the decision of the lower courts.

It has not, however, said exactly what the Reverend Mr. King says it has—not yet, at least.

One inference some people appear to have drawn from the Supreme Court's 1954 opinion is erroneous in fact and mischievous in its practical results.

The dangerous inference comes in two parts. The first is that, since the Supreme Court has held separate education to be unequal, integration by itself will raise the achievement of underprivileged children to equality with the achievement of children of well-educated parents and stable homes. White or black, the children of well-educated parents will generally have an advantage over those of illiterate parents, in any school.

The second part of the fallacy is the assumption that integration, by producing "equal" education, will by itself produce good education. This, by itself, will not do. The content of the curriculum, the size of the classrooms, the training, skill and dedication of teachers and their personal rapport with the children—all these things are important. To get the best takes money, much money.

To be sure, very exceptional children inspired by any influence with a determination to improve themselves can sometimes achieve distinction despite poor schools, poor teachers, or none. Abraham Lincoln went to school 1 year in his whole life; Thomas A. Edison 3 months. But such self-starting geniuses are rare.

A3378

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 28, 1965

For the vast majority of us, good schooling is necessary if we are even to hold a passably good job. And the outer bounds of the physical sciences, important today not only to ordinary industry but also to national security, can be reached only through intensive, specialized, formal education.

Fortunately, the notion that integration by itself will make good schools seems to be fading. Increasing emphasis is being placed on special teaching, as individualized as possible, to compensate for deficiencies in the home environment. Educators, among them Chicago's Superintendent Benjamin Willis, are emphasizing the need for preschool, compensatory, and remedial education.

Still, the myth that integration by itself will do everything apparently lingers on. Otherwise how explain the total lack of involvement of recent demonstration leaders in Chicago in the effort to get a substantial appropriation from the Illinois Legislature for compensatory education? Future education in Chicago faces a real educational crisis, not in heaps of people blocking traffic at State and Madison Streets, but at Springfield.

I do not recommend that hundreds of people sprawl over the statehouse steps or block traffic at any intersection of downtown Springfield. The effect would be negative. But there are dignified and appropriate methods by which responsive friends of better education can communicate with State senators.

Even if one assumed that integration, by itself, would produce better education, a realistic observer would have to note the difficulty of achieving it, totally, in other big cities.

Washington, D.C., is a city where the school administration interpreted the 1954 Supreme Court decision as a call to abolish de facto segregation as well as legal segregation.

After 11 years, its schools are the most segregated in the Nation, outside the South.

In 1954, about half of Washington's schoolchildren were white. Now the proportion of Negroes in Washington schools is about the same as the proportion of Negroes in Chicago's public housing—not many points away from 100 percent and getting closer all the time. Still, a clergyman from Washington has participated in the recent Chicago demonstrations—to teach us what?

New York tried hard, on the same principle, with results which the Allen Commission reported last summer amounted to less than nothing. Each year the number of segregated schools in New York grows. New York's superintendent has been fired, and the president of the school board has resigned. What next?

I consider it educationally desirable that white and Negro children should get to know each other. But the organization of any big city school system so that the numbers in every class reflect the exact racial proportions of the school age population is not merely difficult. It is plainly impossible.

Twentieth Anniversary of the United Nations

SPEECH
OF**HON. RODNEY M. LOVE**
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, on this 20th anniversary of the United Nations, I should like to add my voice to those of other Congressmen in the praise of this international organization.

Although many imperfections still exist and its effectiveness is particularly in question now owing to disagreements among the major powers, the United Nations still remains the greatest hope mankind has against the scourge of war.

My hope would be that the Congress and the Nation, in our desire for peace and justice to men everywhere, will find expression through cooperation with one another. The United Nations gives us this chance.

FE *(VN)* Multer

The Nature of the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 27, 1965.

The Vietnamese Communists cannot be whitewashed. Their brutality and immorality should be obvious to all.

The editorial follows:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY

Those who regard war as immoral, or American involvement in Vietnam as immoral, will consider the slaying of an American prisoner by the Vietcong and the bombing of a Saigon restaurant as a natural consequence of the military actions of the United States. But most Americans, we believe, will draw different conclusions.

War is, from its very nature, a brutal business and revolution is more brutal still. In South Vietnam, North Vietnam is waging war through revolution. It should not be forgotten that the division of Vietnam was intended to make a rough (very rough) geographical separation of Communists and non-Communist areas, and that many non-Communists left their homes in the North for sanctuary in the South. The free national elections specified in the Geneva Treaty were rejected by the South because Communist rule in the North would have made any countrywide "free" election a mockery. So the North, and the Communists still in the South, undertook to subvert the South by propaganda and terror.

This process was well advanced before the United States fired a shot. When it did so, the Americans observed the rules of war; they tried, and are trying, to attack only military targets and to spare the civilian population as much as is humanly possible under the conditions. The Vietcong observe no such inhibitions. They bomb, for shock effect, in civilian centers, just as they terrorize the farmers of the countryside. And when their agents are executed for specific acts of treason and terrorism, they retaliate against an American soldier who has fallen into their hands as a prisoner of war.

It is a curious moral obliquity which can justify the acts of the Vietcong and find nothing but condemnation for those of the United States; which would have this country abandon South Vietnam to a system that began the war with terror and proposes to unify Vietnam with terror. That is the nature of the enemy we are fighting—and whatever hard choices the United States may face in southeast Asia cannot be obscured by whitewash.

On Presidential Disability and Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. JOHN BRADEMAS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week House and Senate conferees agreed upon a much-needed Presidential disability and succession amendment to the Constitution. The author of this proposed amendment is my distinguished colleague from Indiana, Senator BIRCH BAYH, who has provided outstanding leadership in meeting this important problem.

This week the conferees' report will come to the floor of both houses for consideration. I know that this is a matter of serious concern to all Members of Congress and, therefore, I, under unanimous consent, include in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the South Bend Tribune this month: "No Time To Stall," June 7, 1965, and "At Last" June 25, 1965:

NO TIME TO STALL

Both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives have approved a constitutional amendment dealing with presidential disability, but the amendment is in danger of never reaching the States for ratification because the two Houses of Congress can't agree on one small point.

At issue is the question of how long Congress would be allowed to take in deciding who is President when a Vice President challenges the right of a once-disabled President to resume office.

The Senate version of the amendment imposes no time limit. Senate tradition holds unlimited debate to be an all-but-sacred privilege and the thought of even a constitutional deadline on any Senate decision apparently appals the members of the world's most exclusive club. The House, which has a more practical attitude toward debate, put a 10-day limit in its version of the amendment.

There are reports that House conferees are willing to stretch the limit to 21 days, but they won't remove all limitation. And we don't blame them. It is hard to imagine Congress requiring even 10 days to make such an urgent decision as deciding whether a President may reoccupy his office.

Such a period would be difficult enough for the Nation to weather without congressional stalling and indecision. A time limit is in order, and the shorter the better.

Let the Senate swallow its "unlimited debate" mystique on this important issue so that the States may get on with the business of ratifying a vital constitutional amendment.

AT LAST

The agreement of House and Senate conferees on a constitutional amendment for the determination of presidential disability and succession is most welcome.

The agreement gives Congress 21 days to decide the issue when the Vice President contests the right of a once disabled President to resume office. The earlier House version of the amendment imposed a 10-day limit. The Senate, with its strong feelings for unlimited debate, set no limit.

It is to the credit of the Senate that it swallowed its pride on this vital question and accepted a time limit. Obviously, a matter of such importance to the Federal Gov-